8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RH1 Caucasia RH1



the couple does not become acquainted with one another till their wedding day.[48] In Khevsuria the girl used to move into the house of her future father-in-law before her marriage, and there she would take part in the family work for three to fourteen days, but all this time she was not allowed to associate with anyone except the female members of the family. After that she returned to her own household and lived there for two weeks at least (sometimes two or three years), during which time she was not allowed to meet her lover. In fact, he was even forbidden to enter her village.[49] In Pshavia, as we have seen above (p. 105), the engaged couple is allowed to meet frequently.

The obligation of mutual avoidance is also observed by the neighbouring OSSETES.[50]

In this regard the neighbouring TARTARS do not differ either. The Kumyk may visit his future wife only privately and is strictly forbidden to speak to her in the presence of others.[51] The Karachai suitor is forbidden to speak not only with his beloved but also with his future parents-in-law.[52]

### 2. Mutual Fidelity

The *adats* of the North Caucasians do not tell us whether the obligation is bilateral or not. The female partner, of course, is strictly bound to fidelity as will be clear from our exposition of the proof of virginity demanded of the bride on her wedding night *(infra,* p. 124) and from Chapter XII on sexual violations.

### 3. The Obligation of Entering upon Marriage

Islamic law gives both parties the right to dissolve the engagement at will.[53] It will be interesting to find out whether in this particular case the *adats* are observed or the *šarî'a.*

The NORTHWESTERN CAUCASIANS. The "Collection of adats for the Black Sea-Cordon Line, Kuban and Terek Territories" (§ 195) informs us that "the man has a right to break his engagement at will; and, at the request of his fiancée or her relatives, he may permit the girl to withdraw her promises."[54] This adat clearly shows that the obligation is unilateral. "The girl [or her family] may not break the engagement without her fiancé's consent."[54]

The NORTHEASTERN CAUCASIANS. The following table will give us a good idea of the Chechen *adats.*

---

[48] Dubrovin, *Istorija,* I, ii, p. 309.

[49] M. O. Kosven, "Peržitki matriarchata u narodov Kavkaza," SE, 1936, No. 4—5, p. 216.

[50] Dubrovin, *Istorija,* I, i, p. 333; Byhan, *op. cit.,* p. 212.

[51] Dubrovin, *Istorija,* I, i, p. 638.

[52] Byhan, *op. cit.,* pp. 245 f.

[53] Juynboll, *op. cit.,* p. 163.

[54] Leontovič, II, p. 257, § 196.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHl Caucasia RHl



565 The Cherkess formerly had a very important ceremony, which however seems no longer to be observed, the virginity test.[17] Formerly if the bride were found to have lost her virginity before her wedding, she would be returned to her father, who would mercilessly mutilate, sell or even kill her.[18]

[591] A week later the so-called *unaishe* (i. e., "introducing the young wife into the household") takes place. Up to this time she had to live in her own quarters, but from now on she is considered a full-fledged member of the family. In the midst of much shouting and shooting, songs and cheers, the young wife is led into the house by two women. She is wrapped in a shawl and wears tiny [592] stilts attached to the soles of her shoes, which make her look unusually tall. She enters, stands shyly against the wall and then waits for someone to remove her shawl. Thereupon a woman places with her finger a sweet liquid called *urtsetl* into the mouth of the bride in order that her life in the new household may be ever as sweet as *urtsetl*.[19]

Only women were present in the house when the bride entered. They now all take a drink of beer from a large common vessel, then sing and finally break into a dance till wedding songs are heard from outside. This is a sign for the bride to come out, and as soon as she crosses the threshold, a boy standing on the roof, lets down a shower of confetti, nuts and tiny pasteries.

The bride then retires to her room, while the guests feast, drink and dance.

Some days later a ceremony called "Reconciliation" takes place. The bride's girl-friends take part in dances at the home of the groom while the young men join the bridegroom in his hiding place, where drinking is preferred [606] to dancing. The groom then makes a little speech, thanking his "foster-father" for his kindness, and in return for all the courtesies shown him during his "adoption," he offers him an ox or a horse. The groom has been "hiding" all this time, and now he feels that it is about time for him to seek "reconciliation" with his family. In the meantime a sheep has been slaughtered and beer has been prepared for a feast when the "prodigal son" returns. A special cup of beer sweetened with honey and a little "snack" are waiting for him on a small side-table. All eyes are riveted on the son who "ran away" from home. The young ladies are bunched together in a corner of the room; the old men are likewise huddled against one of the walls; the parents of the groom and an honoured guest, an old man, stand in another corner of the room, while the bride with her girl-friends stands in the doorway. Suddenly the loud voice of the honoured guest calls all to attention. "Dear son," he cries, "you think that you have offended us, but you are mistaken. On the contrary, you have caused us indescribable joy! Come take this drink as a reward! Come, son, drink it and let us forget about the past." The groom rises and slowly approaches the old man, accepts the beer and hands it to his attendant. Thereupon he steps outside of the house where he drinks the beer and together with his companions partakes of the "snack." After a while he retires, while his companions and guests continue their feasting and dancing till morning.

---

[17] Cf. Ladyženskij, FT, p. 184.

[18] Byhan, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[19] *Urtsetl* is made of sheep's fat or butter mixed with honey.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHl Caucasia RHl



## § 2. PROBLEMS AND CONCLUSIONS

Though the wedding ceremonies just described are not without a few traces of a mother-right culture, the wedding as a whole is doubtless typically patriarchal in character.

(1) The wedding procession clearly shows that the marriage is patrilocal, a fact true of all North Caucasian as well as neighbouring tribes. The bride must move into the house of her father-in-law.

(2) The fact that the bride is humiliated before her mother-in-law (not father-in-law), the fact that she is invited into the household by the mother-in-law (not father-in-law), and that it is the mother-in-law (not father-in-law) who places the honey into the mouth of the bride, though very suspiciously matriarchal, is reconcilable with a strictly patriarchal society. Even in a strictly patriarchal society the mother of the household enjoys certain privileges and is looked upon as the mistress of the house with special authority over the female members of the household. In other words, in these seemingly matriarchal ceremonies the mother-in-law may perhaps be simply excercising a right of the mother of the household of a typical patriarchal family.[103]

(3) The dramatization of bride capture is a very common custom among the pastoral peoples throughout the world.

Ceremonial bride capture must not be considered as a survival of actual marriage by capture. This is especially true of the Caucasians because a wedding always means a great economic loss for the bride's family—one of their workers must leave them and go over to another sib. Ceremonial bride capture expresses rather the opposition to such an heavy loss. The Dido, as we have seen, actually throw mud and filth at the bride after she has been "stolen". If the ceremony were to represent actual abduction, why should the bride be so "mistreated"? The reason why filth is thrown at her is that she has turned "traitor" to her own family.

(4) The ceremony of hiding, veiling of the face, the bride's taciturnity—all these little peculiarities of the Caucasian wedding may be an expression of the bride's natural sense of modesty. Till now she had to avoid, at least in public, the slightest communication with her financé. The strict separation of engaged couples, the prohibition even to pass a glance at one's future mate in public, and the death penalty imposed on the girl for pre-marital intercourse—all this is in full accord with the high esteem of pastoral peoples for the physical integrity of virgins. At the wedding, the bride is being publicly introduced into a relationship which she has been taught to shun as disgraceful, even punishable by death. Now this once "disgraceful" thing is being done publicly! The bride's resistence, her fleeing, her veiling, her taciturnity, then, are expressions of a reaction against "the great change"[104] from maidenhood to wife, a change more sensibly felt among pastoral peoples than in any other society.

[103] For the relatively important rôle of a mother of a household in a patriarchal society see E. Pčelina, "Obrjad gostepriimstva v Osetii," SE, (1932), No. 5—6, pp. 140—163, especially p. 156, *note*.

[104] "The great change," I think, has been coined by Elsie C. Person. See her "Holding back in Crisis Ceremonialism," *American Anthropologist*, n. s. XVIII (1916), pp. 44 f.

4/n [Sic--Analyst]

# Chapter XI

# Marital, Parental, and Kinship Avoidances

593 602 In our description of the engagement and marriage customs we have already mentioned some obligations of mutual avoidance. After marriage a certain mutual avoidance continues not only between the couple but also between parent and child, and between the couple and their kinship by marriage.

## § 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE CUSTOMS

The NORTHWESTERN CAUCASIANS. Among the oldest reports we have are those of Pallas. He informs us that in the eighteenth century the Cherkess husband and wife were not allowed to appear together before strangers.[1] In fact, for a year after marriage or till the birth of the first child the husband was not allowed to visit his wife except secretly.[2] And even afterwards when the couple lived under the same roof, they were not allowed to share the same room. In the beginning of the nineteenth century Longworth and Dubois de Montpéreux noticed the same custom, practiced in all its rigour, which both authors compare to the spirit of the ancient Spartans.[3] The *adat* collections of about an hundred years ago likewise speak of this strict separation of husband and wife in public and private life.[4] In the beginning of this century, Vasil'kov wrote that the Temirgoi customary law does not permit a wife as much as to mention the name of her husband in the presence of others. She must always use the pronoun "he" instead.[5]

591 Though the Northwesterners of today have given up many of their ancient practices, they have not abandoned these rules of marital avoidance. Ladyženskij found them still in our own times. For a year after marriage the wife must live with strangers, during which time her husband may visit her only secretly. To be seen with her in public even years after marriage, he informs us, is tabooed.[6]

This avoidance includes even the children of the family, as we have seen in our section on "Parental Affection for Offspring" (pp. 149 f). Throughout

---

[1] *Bemerkungen auf einer Reise in die süd. Statth., etc.*, I, p. 388.
[2] *ibid.*
[3] Longworth, *op. cit.*, I, p. 285; Dubois de Montpéreux, *op. cit.*, I, p. 115.
[4] Leontovič, II, pp. 254 f, § 176.
[5] "Očerk byta temirgoevcev," SMOMPK, XXIX (1901), No. 1, p. 99.
[6] Ladyženskij, FT. p. 184 *note*; Ladyženskij, "Zur Erforschung der Rechtsgewohnheiten der Bergvölker des Kaukasus," Zeitsch. f. Ethnologie, LXII (1930), pp. 242.

p. 162

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RH1 Caucasia RH1
Description



the Caucasus a father is forbidden to manifest his affection for his child. The Cherkess is forbidden even to speak of a child of a person present.[7]

Similar *adats* forbid a couple to appear together before their parents or parents-in-law for a year after marriage,[8] and among the Abkhaz, even longer.[9]

The NORTHEASTERN CAUCASIANS. These rules of avoidance are found also among the Chechens, with only accidental differences. After marriage the groom must leave his wife and family and live with some neighbours or relatives for two to three weeks.[10] But even afterwards, when he returns, a certain law of separation must be observed. Reineggs reporting on the customs in the eighteenth century mentions that the husband did not share a common room with his wife; the men, he tells us, lived apart from the children and the female members of the family.[11] Another *adat* forbids a husband to eat with his wife in the presence of strangers.[12] And even in strictest privacy he will never speak directly to her in the second person: he usually will turn aside somewhat and instead of saying "Give me," he will say, "I am in need of."[13]

An Ingush father is not only forbidden to carry or fondle his child in public, but is not even allowed to call it by its name,[14] when others are present.

Jakovlev assures us that one can meet Ingushi today who have not seen their mothers-in-law for fifteen years after the wedding,[15] for to do so would be a serious violation of an Ingush custom. A wife is forbidden to mention the name of a first cousin of her husband in the presence of her parents- or brothers-in-law.[16] A husband may never inquire about his wife's relatives.[17] He will not speak with his wife in the presence of his parents or older brothers.[18] According to Dubrovin, a wife is strictly forbidden to speak with her father-in-law or any near male relative of her husband for a certain time after the wedding. She may speak with her mother-in-law only after a number of months have elapsed.[19]

There is also a certain avoidance observed by the husband and wife among the mountain tribes of Daghestan. A Lesghian, for example, will never put his arm around his wife while dancing. Such signs of intimacy in the presence of others would be unthinkable.[20]

We have already mentioned the example of how a certain Boulat-khan brought on himself the contempt of a group of men of Andi for carrying his son

---

[7] Pallas, *l. c.*
[8] Ladyženskij, FT, p. 186.
[9] Byhan, *op. cit.*, p. 152.
[10] Cf. Jakovlev, *Inguši*, p. 56.
[11] Reineggs, *op. cit.*, I, p. 41.
[12] Leontovič, II, p. 254, § 170.
[13] Dubrovin, *Istorija*, I, i, p. 438.
[14] Grabovskij, "Inguši, ich žizn i obyčai," SSKG, IX (1876), p. 49.
[15] Jakovlev, *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 57.
[16] Jakovlev, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
[17] *ibid.*
[18] *ibid.*
[19] *Istorija*, I, i, p. 434.
[20] Nansen, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

in his arms; to make up for the transgression of the *adat* forbidding public manifestation of affection for one's children, he took out his dagger, crying, "I love my son, but you shall see also that I don't mind killing him," and if the men had not succeeded in calming him, he would have actually killed the child.[21]

It is indeed striking that we do not find the parent-in-law avoidances among the Lesghians; at least we have not found any reports in this regard. Parent-in-law avoidances would be quite impossible among the Lesghians, owing to the rule of endogamy.[22]

The SOUTHERN CAUCASIANS. Among the mountain tribes of Georgia the bride and groom, after having spent three days together,[23] are obliged to separate, the groom remaining with his parents and the bride returning to her family. The period of separation, according to Eristov, was a fortnight, according to Seidlitz, depending on agreement,[24] and according to Kosven, "for some weeks or years."[25] In ancient Imeretia the newly-weds would live at the bride's house for a week, after which the young man returned to his father's house, while his wife remained with her family for a year.[26] During the period of separation the husband might visit his wife only secretly. On her return to her husband she did not share a common room with him.[27] A Pshav couple may not call each other by name; instead they use the words "Man!" and "Woman!"[28] Similarly, the wife may not call any of her husband's male relatives by name.[29] In Svanetia one may not inquire about the health of the wife of another person unless related to her.[30] A Svan will never permit his wife to sit down beside him; and, in general, he is very reluctant to converse with her.[31] In Khevsuria a father may not carry his child in his arms or say a single friendly word to it in the presence of others.[32]

The OSSETES. In Ossetia the husband must live at the groomsman's house for a whole month after the wedding. He is forbidden to oppear before his father, older members of the household, or any older relatives and may visit his wife only secretly.[33] As soon as the young wife becomes pregnant she returns to her family and stays there till the child is born.[34]

---

[21] *Supra*, pp. 149 f.

[22] *Supra*, pp. 51 f.

[23] Nansen, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[24] Eristov, *op. cit.*, p. 110. Seidlitz, "Gemeinde- und Familienleben der Chewsuren," *Das Ausland*, 1891, No. 16, p. 320.

[25] M. O. Kosven, "Perežitki matriarchata u narodov Kavkaza," SE, 1936, No. 4—5, p. 217.

[26] *ibid.*

[27] Eristov, *op. cit.*, p. 111. See also Eichwald, *Reise auf dem Kaspischen Meer und in den Kaukasus*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 204.

[28] Makalatija, "Iz starogo narodnogo byta Pšavov," SE, 1938, No. 1, p. 109.

[29] Hahn, *Bilder aus dem Kaukasus*, p. 82.

[30] Dubrovin, *Istorija*, I, ii, p. 109.

[31] *ibid.*

[32] *Supra*, p. 150.

[33] Baddeley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 269.

[34] Hahn, "Die Täler der 'Grossen Ljachwa' und Ksanka (ksan) und das südliche Ossetien," *Globus*, LXXXVIII (1905), p. 24. It is worthy of note that the Kurds and the Armenians

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHI Caucasia RHI


We have given a number af examples (*supra*, p. 150) illustrating how Ossetine fathers and mothers are forbidden to take their children in their arms, or by hand, or offer them anything, in the presence of older members of the family. The Ossete would permit his child to die rather than transgress this rule.

A woman may never in her whole life speak to an older male member of her husbands's family, and if, for instance, the wife of a younger brother is busy at the hearth, an elder brother is not allowed to enter the room till she has finished her work.[35]

The neighbouring TURKS observe similar rules of avoidance. Thus the Karachai newly-weds live together for a few months and then the bride must return to her parental home for a period which may last two years. During this time her husband may visit her only secretly.[36] The Nogai will not speak to his wife in the presence of elderly people except in extreme necessity. The wife must always appear veiled before her husband for a year after marriage or till she gives birth to a child.[37] A Kumykian couple may never call each other by name; instead they refer to each other as "him" and "her."[38]

## § 2. PROBLEMS OF POSSIBLÆ ORIGIN AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RULES OF AVOIDANCE

We may divide the customs just described into several distinct groups. The following table will show that these rules of avoidance are genuinely Caucasian, found among all North Caucasians and neighbouring peoples.

(1) The first custom which calls for special attention is that requiring the bride to return to her family shortly after marriage and permitting the husband to visit her only secretly. We found this custom in Ossetia, Armenia, Kurdistan, Chechnia, Georgia and among the Caucasian Turks. The Cherkess bride, however, does not return to her own parents but goes to a neighbouring family. This temporary visit-marriage, though still not definitely proven, may be connected with matrilocality, and therefore this custom may be a vestige of a mother-right culture.

It is interesting that the Cherkess bride lives with *strangers* during this period and not with her own family. Ladyženskij[39] considers this practice a vestige of the original form of acquiring a wife, namely bride-stealing. When a bride was stolen she, naturally, had to hide, and here, he argues, we have a clear

---

had a similar observance. Among the Kurds the bride would return to her family a few days after her marriage. Her stay with her parents, however, was very short, lasting about three days or so. After receiving some gifts from her family she returned to her husband Cf. Kosven, *l. c.*). The custom of the bride returning to her family after the wedding is also an Armenian practice (*ibid.*).

[35] Baddeley, *l. c.*

[36] Jankó, "Néprajzi, etc." Zichy, *Kaukázusi és középázsia utazásai*, p. 44.

[37] Dubrovin, *Istorija*, I, i, p. 279.

[38] Dubrovin, *op. cit.*, I, i, p. 639.

[39] "Zur Erforschung der Rechtsgewohnheiten der Bergvölker des Kaukasus," *Zeitsch. f. Ethnologie*, XLII (1930), p. 242.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHI Caucasia RHI
The Family
166

# TABLE 18

## Rules of Marital, Parental, and Kinship Avoidance

| RULES | Abkhaz | Cherkess | Chechens | Lesghians | Mountaineers of Georgia | Ossetes | Karachai |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Bride and groom must live separately after wedding | For a year or till first child | For a year or till first child | For two or three weeks | No | Three to fourteen days | For a month after the wedding | Live together one month, then separate |
| 2. Bride returns to her own family after the wedding | Bride lives with strangers | Bride lives with strangers | No, but husband must live elsewhere 2 to 3 weeks | No | Yes | Yes, goes to own family some months after wedding | Two months to two years with own family |
| 3. Husband may visit wife during this period only secretly | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 4. Married couples may not appear together in public or before strangers | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | | |
| 5. When living in same house after period of separation the couple may not share common quarters | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 6. May not mention name of husband | | May not do so before others | Husband avoids speaking directly to wife even in private | No | Wife may not call husband by name and vice versa | | |
| 7. Prohibition to manifest love for one's own child before others | Yes | Yes. Also may not speak of child of person present | Yes. Father may not carry or fondle it | Yes | Yes. May not carry or say friendly word to child | Yes. Rule is very strict | |
| 8. Husband must avoid parents-in-law | For several years | For a year after marriage | Husband may never speak to mother-in-law | No | | Yes | |
| 9. Wife must avoid older male relatives of husband (or husband must avoid relatives of wife) | | | Wife may not mention name of husband's first-cousin | No | May not call them by name | Yes | |
| 10. The couple may not be seen together by parents or parents-in-law | For a year after marriage | For a year after marriage | Yes | | | Yes, during period of separation | Yes, during period of separation |

591
538
606
603

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RH1 Caucasia RH1



race of this epoch. He goes on to say that the *kalym* was originally a form of bloodwite demanded for bride-stealing, which later evolved into a means of compensating the family of the bride for the loss of a worker. Although Ladyženskij's interpretations are generally good, we connot agree with him in this particular point. It has never been proven that bride-stealing was the original form of marriage anywhere in the world. Moreover, it seems to be much more probable that bride-stealing resulted from the practice of bride purchase rather than vice versa. That *kalym* evolved from bloodwite is very improbable, especially in the Caucasus, because reconciliation by means of bloodwite seems to be a relatively recent substitution for actual blood vengeance.

(2) The various husband-wife avoidances, such as not mentioning the name of one's husband or wife, not using the second person, avoiding all conversation in public, etc. may be an expression of the superior position of the male sex in Caucasian society (cf. *supra*, pp. 152—159).[40]

(3) The parent and parent-in-law avoidance, the obligatory avoidance of older male relatives of the husband, the prohibition of inquiring about the health of the wife's or husband's relatives, and similar practices are difficult to explain.

Parent-in-law avoidances are certainly among the most universal practices known to man. In fact, this form of avoidance is so universal that Lowie does not hesitate to write, " From the extremely wide range of parent-in-law avoidance, the absolute universality of these rules might be conjectured on the ground that, where unrecorded, the customs have merely eluded notice."[41] In Australia, for example, " it was formerly death for a man to speak to his mother-in-law."[42] In New Britain if a man were speaking accidently with his mother-in-law, the horror of the " crime " would most likely lead to suicide.[43]

The interpretation of parent-in-law taboos has baffled all ethnologists, and a satisfactory answer still has not been given. The parent-in-law avoidance has been connected with exogamy and bride-capture ;[44] it has been considered a vestige of matriarchy, an expression of awe for the mistress of the household ;[45] it has also been considered as a means to prevent improper intercourse. We may have here a case of convergence, based more on human psychology than on any particular institution ; nor is there any reason to attribute the same cause for the practice in all parts of the world. This is but another important ethnological problem that waits to be solved.

---

[40] The Caucasians seem to be of the opinion that separation is the best means of fostering conjugal love (cf. Leontovič, II, pp. 254 f, § 176).

[41] *Primitive Society*, p. 88.

[42] Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South East Australia*, p. 267.

[43] H. H. Romilly, " The Islands of the New Britain Group," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, n. s. IX, p. 9.

[44] Cf. A. H. Post, " Ueber die Sitte, nach welcher Verlobte und Ehegatten ihre gegenseitigen Verwandten meiden," *Globus*, LXVII (1895), pp. 176 f.

[45] Cf. R. Briffault, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 266 f.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHl Caucasia RHl



177 58 56 These have been felt either exclusively among the Southern Caucasians or have not been very great. The Roman-Byzantine influence was passed on to the North Caucasian tribes mainly through the Armenians and Georgians, which, however, did not affect their customary laws to any appreciable extent. Kovalevskij had a tendency to overemphasize these influences: he believed, for example, that the practice of offering an engagement gift to the bride or her family was of Roman-Byzantine origin,[7] and that the status of the Caucasian women had been greatly affected by Byzantine law.[8]

## § 2. MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY OF THE CAUCASIANS IN THE LIGHT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

### 1. Analysis of Caucasian Adats: . Predominant Character of North Caucasian Marriage and Family Customary Laws That of a Pastoral Nomadic Civilization

58 171 After having removed the above-mentioned historical influences and changes in the marriage and family laws of the Caucasians, we now arrive at a more or less pure *adat*-law. Considering the marriage and family customary laws as a whole, we must conclude that we have before us a typically pastoral nomadic[9] marriage and family, and this although there are no pastoral nomads in the Caucasus in the strict sense of the word. Though some of the elements we shall now enumerate are also found in other cultures (for example, adultery is sometimes punished as severely by food-gatherers as by pastoral nomads), it is not the individual example we wish to stress but rather the entire institution of marriage and family taken as a whole. It should also be noted that the following summary is only an incomplete and general one: for details, therefore, the reader must look up the references given.

[595] (1) We have seen, for example, how widespread *polygyny* was among the North Caucasians.[10] We fully agree with Briffault, who has shown that all pastoral societies and societies which have passed "through a prolonged pastoral stage are all without exception in the highest degree polygamous."[11]

[597] (2) The *atalyk*,[12]

[391] (3) the *levirate*,[13]

(4) *patrilocality*,[14]

[7] Kovalevskij, *Zakon*, I, p. 136.

[8] Kovalevskij, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 139 f. He treats of these influences in detail in *op. cit.*, I, pp. 83—122.

[9] By pastoral nomadic we understand the various customs and laws commonly found among all the pastoral nomadic Turco-Mongols and Indo-Europeans. Many of the components of the Semitic and Hamitic cultures are also pastoral nomadic. Whether the pastoral nomadic culture is a primary (i. e., immediately following upon the food-gathering stage, being the oldest form of animal-breeding) or only secondary or even tertiary (i. e., the result of later specialization, a further development of a pastoral-agrarian culture) does not affect our analysis nor any of our conclusions.

[10] *Supra*, pp. 39—50.

[11] *The Mothers*, II, p. 256.

[12] *Supra*, p. 57.

[13] *Supra*, pp. 71—75.

[14] *Supra*, pp. 124 f.